DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 127 967 IR 003 932

| | |
|---|---|
| TITLE | National Survey of Film and Television Higher Education; Report of Findings. |
| INSTITUTION | American Film Inst., Washington, D.C. |
| SPONS AGENCY | National Endowment for the Arts, Washington, D.C. |
| PUB DATE | Aug 76 |
| NOTE | 31p. |
| EDRS PRICE | MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage. |
| DESCRIPTORS | Colleges; Curriculum; Films; *Film Study; *Higher Education; *National Surveys; *Tables (Data); *Television; Universities |

ABSTRACT

These data are the result of a survey taken in 1975 by the American Film Institute to assess individuals and organizations actively involved in film and/or television education. Survey instruments were sent to 3,276 film and/or television educators at colleges and universities throughout the United States. Tabular summaries of the 784 responses provide information on staff characteristics, staff attitudes, program resources, and program needs. (EMH)

**********
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
**********

ED127967

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

# NATIONAL SURVEY OF FILM AND TELEVISION HIGHER EDUCATION

## REPORT OF FINDINGS

THE AMERICAN FILM INSTITUTE

August 1976

IR003932

## Study Committee

Task Force Group:

Raymond Fielding
Department of Radio/
Television/Film
Temple University

Donald Staples
(Task Force Chairman)
Department of
Cinema Studies
New York University

Howard Suber
Motion Picture/
Television Division
U. of California,
Los Angeles

Robert W. Wagner
Department of
Photography & Cinema
Ohio State University

Advisory Review Group:

Erik Barnouw
Professor Emeritus
Columbia University

Edgar Dale
Professor Emeritus
Ohio State University

Anna Hyer
Coordinator, Instruction and
Professional Development
National Education Association

## For The American Film Institute

Sam L. Grogg, Jr., Project Coordinator
Dennis Bohnenkamp, Survey Expediter
Diana Elsas and Lulu Kelso, Assistants

Special Consultants: Joseph Ziegler, Arts Development Associates; Edward Singer, R/S Associates, Inc.

This project was funded by the National Endowment for the Arts, an independent agency of the Federal Government created in 1965 to encourage and assist the nation's cultural resources. Nancy Hanks, Chairman. The National Endowment for the Arts is located at 2401 E Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20506.

The American Film Institute is an independent, non-profit organization serving the public interest, established in 1967 by the National Endowment for the Arts to advance the art of film and television in the United States. George Stevens, Jr., Director. © 1976 The American Film Institute, John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, Washington, D.C. 20566.

Portions of this report may be reprinted with permission of The American Film Institute.

## FOREWORD

The American Film Institute received a grant from the National Endowment for the Arts to conduct "a survey and study of individuals, organizations, institutions, and special facilities actively involved in film/television education in order to develop its priorities for programs and services in education." The grant period was designated as October 15, 1975 to June 15, 1976.

From the outset of the project, The American Film Institute and all those involved in the project expressed their intention to conduct a study of "pedagogical and scholastic needs of film and television education in the U.S." that would be of use to the field as a whole and not simply a guide to a single institution concerning education policy or procedure.

AFI Education Liaison Sam L. Grogg, Jr. served as Project Coordinator. The study was conducted by a committee of well known educators in the field. That Study Committee was divided into two elements: a Task Force group and an Advisory Review group.

The Task Force contingent of the Committee was made up of Raymond Fielding, Temple University; Donald Staples, New York University; Howard Suber, University of California-Los Angeles; and Robert W. Wagner, Ohio State University. These people were responsible for the study's methodology, design of research tools

developed, and summary and presentation of data gathered by the project.

The Study Committee developed a questionnaire survey instrument that was sent to 3,276 film and/or television educators at colleges and universities throughout the United States. 784 individuals responded to the survey. The data gathered was tabulated so that certain portions of the survey could be computer processed, analyzed, and stored.

The Study Committee prepared an objective report on the survey which was submitted to The American Film Institute and the National Endowment for the Arts on June 15, 1976. What follows are findings of that report based upon the 784 completed questionnaires (24% of those surveyed). It should be noted that due to rounding off percentages, the possibility of multiple response, and occasional omission of irrelevant responses, the percentages do not always total one hundred percent.

In addition to the tallies included in this report, capabilities for further analysis of the data have been written into the computer program. Demographic breakdowns such as academic department, academic rank, teaching emphasis, etc. have been cross-referenced against seventeen of the attitudinal questions asked in the questionnaire. This data will be kept on file at the Administrative Offices of The American Film Institute, at the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts in Washington, D.C., and made available to researchers and educators.

## SURVEY FINDINGS

Tallies are presented as percentages of total respondents (784).

Respondents' type of school:

57% teach at a university; 24% at a four-year college; 14% at a two-year college; 3% did not respond to the question.

---

Academic department of respondents:

Respondents were asked to indicate the title of the department in which they taught. Those responding to the question listed 91 different department names. An attempt has been made to cluster departmental names whose program emphasis appears to be related. A full list of the departments indicated within the cluster is given in the appendix.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | Communication related departments | 19% |
| 2. | Broadcasting related departments | 13 |
| 3. | English related departments | 13 |
| 4. | Speech related departments | 13 |
| 5. | Film/cinema related departments | 9 |
| 6. | Art related departments | 6 |
| 7. | Theater/drama related departments | 5 |
| 8. | Audiovisual education related departments | 3 |
| 9. | Photography related departments | 3 |
| 10. | Journalism related departments | 3 |
| 11. | Other | 10 |
| No Response | | 4 |

---

2.

Department's Courses:

| | |
|---|---|
| Both Graduate and Undergraduate | 46% |
| Primarily Graduate | 4 |
| Primarily Undergraduace | 45 |
| No Response | 3 |

---

Number of full time faculty members teaching film/television in respondents' departments:

| Number: | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10+ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| % : | 3 | 22 | 16 | 12 | 9 | 7 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 13 |

---

Academic rank of respondents:

| | |
|---|---|
| Professor | 19% |
| Associate Professor | 24 |
| Assistant Professor | 28 |
| Adjunct Professor | 2 |
| Instructor | 14 |
| Adjunct Instructor | 1 |
| Lecturer | 3 |
| Graduate Assistant, Teaching Assistant | 1 |
| Other | 1 |
| None/No Response | 8 |

---

Administrative title (if any):

2% indicate titles at the level of college or university administration such as president, dean, or assistant dean; 11% indicate they are department or division chairpersons; 24% have titles of program administrators other than chairpersons; 5% have non-academic administrative titles such as television or radio station managers; and 54% of the respondents did not indicate an administrative title.

---

Full or part time faculty:

79% are full time, 17% part time, and 3% did not respond.

---

Primary emphasis of teaching in film and/or television:

| | |
|---|---|
| Film studies | 46% |
| Film production | 30 |
| Television studies | 20 |
| Television production | 21 |
| Other | 5 |
| No Response | 5 |

---

Years teaching film/television courses:

| Years: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10-15 | 15+ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| % : | 3 | 7 | 9 | 9 | 12 | 10 | 7 | 5 | 3 | 17 | 11 |

---

4.

Percentage of teaching devoted to film/television teaching:

| % of teaching: | 100 | 75-99 | 50-74 | 25-49 | 0-24 | N/R |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| % of respondents: | 40 | 11 | 17 | 15 | 11 | 6 |

---

Other professional activities which take up major portions of time:

| | |
|---|---|
| Teaching subjects other than film/television | 26% |
| Education administration | 19 |
| Film production | 16 |
| Writing | 13 |
| Research | 12 |
| Film/television administration | 9 |
| Television production | 8 |
| Consulting | 4 |
| No Response | 13 |

---

EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND OF RESPONDENTS

Degrees:

| | |
|---|---|
| Doctor of Philosophy | 43% |
| Doctor of Education | 3 |
| Doctoral Degree in Progress | 4 |
| Master of Arts | 21 |
| Master of Science | 7 |
| Master of Fine Arts | 4 |
| Bachelor of Arts | 6 |

NOTE: The following degrees were also reported by individuals but the percentage of respondents was below 3 percent: Doctor of Fine Arts, Doctor of Divinity, Doctor of Law, Doctor of Arts, Master of Education, Master of Business Administration, Master of Divinity, Bachelor of Science, Bachelor of Fine Arts, Associate of Arts, and No Degree. 6% did not respond to this item.

Year highest degree awarded:

| | |
|---|---|
| 1959 or before | 17% |
| 1960-1964 | 13 |
| 1965-1970 | 29 |
| 1971-1976 | 28 |
| No Response | 13 |

Institution awarding respondent's highest degree:

| | |
|---|---|
| Columbia University | 5% |
| Indiana University | 3 |
| Michigan State University | 3 |
| New York University | 5 |
| Ohio State University | 5 |
| Syracuse University | 4 |
| University of Iowa | 4 |
| University of Michigan | 3 |
| University of So. California | 4 |
| University of Wisconsin | 4 |

6.

Fields in which respondents have worked professionally for more than 6 months:

| | |
|---|---|
| Film production | 41% |
| Television production | 37 |
| Print/broadcast journalism | 27 |
| Film/television administration | 23 |
| Theater | 3 |
| No Response | 27 |

NOTE: This question offered the respondent four broad categories from which to choose. It also allowed for "other" responses. In total, 25 fields of professional work were indicated, but only the five shown above appeared in significant amounts.

---

Respondent's involvement in research which resulted in publication during the last five years:

| | Yes | No | NR |
|---|---|---|---|
| %: | 47 | 49 | 4 |

---

Respondent's involvement in the training of secondary/elementary school film/television teachers:

| | Yes | No | NR |
|---|---|---|---|
| %: | 35 | 58 | 7 |

---

Professional and scholarly organizations to which respondents belong:

| | |
|---|---|
| University Film Association | 24% |
| American Film Institute | 16 |
| Broadcast Education Association | 15 |
| Speech Communication Association | 15 |
| National Association of Educational Broadcasters | 14 |
| Society for Cinema Studies | 11 |
| Modern Language Association | 9 |
| Association for Educational Communications and Technology | 8 |
| Society of Motion Picture and Television Engineers | 7 |

NOTE: Over one-hundred national organizations were listed in answer to this question. In addition, many respondents listed local organizations and regional study centers (22%), and honorary societies (10%).

---

Respondents were asked to check five resources in the following list that have been important to their career development:

| | |
|---|---|
| Individualized study | 61% |
| Conferences | 56 |
| Formal study | 56 |
| Hands-on workshops | 36 |
| Observing production | 32 |
| Professional seminars and short courses | 32 |
| Visits by noted professionals | 32 |

8.

Resources (cont.):

| | |
|---|---|
| Research grants/fellowships | 27% |
| Sabbaticals | 23 |
| Production grants/fellowships | 21 |
| Faculty exchanges | 17 |
| Internships | 16 |
| Visits by noted professors | 12 |

NOTE: 7% of the respondents indicated the importance of "production experience" by adding it to the list.

---

Position of film/television education in the administrative hierarchy of respondent's school:

| | Film Ed. | TV Ed. |
|---|---|---|
| Respected | 36% | 30% |
| Accepted | 37 | 33 |
| Tolerated | 12 | 10 |
| Threatened | 3 | 3 |
| Will probably be absorbed/abolished | 0 | 0 |
| No Response | 10 | 21 |

---

Enrollment growth in respondents' courses:

Production:

| | Currently | | Next 5 Years | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Film | TV | Film | TV |
| Expanding | 35% | 46% | 34% | 47% |
| Contracting | 4 | 4 | 5 | 4 |
| Same | 18 | 22 | 15 | 21 |
| No Response | 43 | 28 | 45 | 27 |

Studies:

| | Currently | | Next 5 Years | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Film | TV | Film | TV |
| Expanding | 38 | 40 | 39 | 42 |
| Contracting | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 |
| Same | 18 | 23 | 16 | 20 |
| No Response | 39 | 33 | 42 | 35 |

---

The primary goal of the courses respondents teach for each kind of student:

| | Undergraduate | Graduate |
|---|---|---|
| A Liberal Arts education | 52% | 29% |
| Professional training | 24 | 15 |
| Both | 14 | 6 |
| No Response | 8 | 48 |

---

10.

Do students agree? Primary goal of each kind of student:

| | Undergraduate | Graduate |
|---|---|---|
| Professional training | 42% | 36% |
| A Liberal Arts education | 33 | 9 |
| Both | 12 | 4 |
| No Response | 12 | 50 |

---

Using a scale of 1 to 5 ("unimportant" to "very important"), please rank each of the following measures of academic potential for both kinds of incoming students:

Undergraduate:

| | % | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/R |
| Academic record | 6 | 6 | 23 | 21 | 23 | 21 |
| Interview with applicant | 12 | 8 | 18 | 20 | 17 | 23 |
| Portfolios/samples | 17 | 10 | 16 | 16 | 14 | 28 |
| Professional work | 19 | 10 | 15 | 15 | 13 | 28 |
| Professionals' recommendations | 14 | 12 | 21 | 17 | 8 | 28 |
| Standard test scores | 11 | 13 | 25 | 16 | 12 | 24 |
| Statement of purpose | 11 | 12 | 21 | 20 | 11 | 24 |
| Teachers' recommendations | 9 | 10 | 23 | 22 | 10 | 27 |

Graduate:

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/R |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | % | | | | | |
| Academic record | 4 | 3 | 7 | 15 | 25 | 47 |
| Interview with applicant | 5 | 4 | 11 | 12 | 19 | 49 |
| Portfolios/samples | 6 | 4 | 9 | 13 | 17 | 51 |
| Professional work | 5 | 4 | 11 | 16 | 13 | 51 |
| Professionals' recommendations | 4 | 6 | 12 | 16 | 10 | 51 |
| Standard test scores | 6 | 8 | 15 | 12 | 9 | 51 |
| Statement of purpose | 5 | 5 | 10 | 17 | 14 | 49 |
| Teachers' recommendations | 2 | 5 | 13 | 16 | 12 | 51 |

---

Should there be a standard instrument to test student potential?

Academic Potential

| | Yes | No | N/R |
|---|---|---|---|
| %: | 42 | 48 | 9 |

Artistic Potential

| | Yes | No | N/R |
|---|---|---|---|
| %: | 22 | 67 | 11 |

---

12.

Based on respondents' experience, three careers students most often enter:

| | Bachelor | Master | Doctor |
|---|---|---|---|
| College teaching | 6% | 24% | 36% |
| Commercial TV production | 43 | 18 | 1 |
| Educational TV production | 24 | 23 | 5 |
| Film/TV administration | 6 | 13 | 5 |
| Graduate school | 36 | 16 | 3 |
| Print/broadcast journalism | 29 | 10 | 3 |
| Non-feature film production | 21 | 13 | 3 |
| Research/criticism | 2 | 5 | 22 |
| Secondary teaching | 20 | 16 | 3 |
| Theatrical film production | 5 | 2 | 0 |
| No Response | 21 | 44 | 61 |

---

Printed materials for classroom instruction:

| | Use | Needed | Not interested | N/R |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Anthologies | 46% | 16% | 18% | 23% |
| Audience studies | 22 | 29 | 27 | 26 |
| Biographies | 27 | 13 | 30 | 32 |
| Histories | 56 | 16 | 12 | 22 |
| Interviews | 39 | 18 | 15 | 31 |
| Program notes | 23 | 20 | 28 | 31 |
| Published scripts | 38 | 31 | 13 | 26 |
| Reference works | 58 | 18 | 5 | 23 |
| Study guides | 22 | 21 | 31 | 29 |

Printed materials (cont.):

| | Use | Needed | Not interested | N/R |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Technical texts | 60% | 15% | 11% | 19% |
| Transcripts for oral histories | 9 | 22 | 37 | 35 |
| Translations | 19 | 26 | 29 | 32 |
| Unpublished scripts | 19 | 34 | 22 | 30 |

Audio-visual materials for classroom instruction:

| | Use | Needed | Not interested | N/R |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Complete films/ videotapes | 76% | 23% | 1% | 11% |
| Excerpts from film/ television | 48 | 42 | 6 | 18 |
| Films on film/ television | 49 | 36 | 8 | 19 |
| Outtakes | 19 | 43 | 16 | 27 |
| Slides/filmstrips | 32 | 23 | 23 | 27 |
| Tapes of oral histories | 9 | 25 | 35 | 34 |
| Videotapes on film/ television | 33 | 33 | 14 | 27 |

14.

General teaching resources:

| | Use | Needed | Not interested | N/R |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Book/periodical collections | 71% | 18% | 2% | 17% |
| College owned films/videotapes | 61 | 37 | 1 | 15 |
| Commercial film distributors | 56 | 18 | 8 | 2? |
| Commercial theaters | 32 | 20 | 17 | 34 |
| Film societies | 35 | 21 | 14 | 32 |
| Film/videotape archives | 27 | 43 | 7 | 29 |
| Photo/slide collections | 27 | 29 | 16 | 31 |
| Privately owned films/videotapes | 31 | 28 | 11 | 3? |
| Public library films/videotapes | 32 | 30 | 12 | 31 |
| Script collections | 21 | 36 | 15 | 33 |
| Television programs on the air | 48 | 17 | 12 | 27 |

Various teaching methods ranked by respondents on a scale of 1 to 5 ("useless" to "very useful"):

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/R |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Field experience | 5% | 7% | 15% | 22% | 4?% | 12% |
| Lectures | 4 | 10 | 33 | 31 | 15 | 7 |
| Production workshops | 5 | 4 | 10 | 27 | 41 | 13 |
| Screenings | 4 | 8 | 21 | 26 | 33 | 8 |
| Seminars | 4 | 9 | 20 | 31 | 25 | 11 |
| Technical demonstrations | 4 | 10 | 26 | 30 | 16 | 14 |

Films/videotapes respondents most often use in teaching:

482 different titles were mentioned. The following showed significant percentages. In addition, a number of respondents answered this question with a descriptive phrase rather than specific title. Eight percent answered "personally" or "locally" produced films, and five percent felt that the films they used changed too often for them to specify particular titles.

| | |
|---|---|
| 17% | CITIZEN KANE (1941). 119 minutes. Orson Welles. |
| 10 | THE BATTLESHIP POTEMKIN (1925). 75 minutes. Eisenstein. |
| 4 | AN OCCURENCE AT OWL CREEK BRIDGE (1956). 27 minutes. Robert Enrico. |
| 4 | BASIC FILM TERMS: A VISUAL DICTIONARY (1970). 14 minutes. Sheldon Renan. |
| 4 | THE BIRTH OF A NATION (1915). 102 minutes (varies--also 195 minutes). D.W. Griffith. |
| 4 | INTERPRETATIONS AND VALUES. (1964). 30 minutes. American Cinema Editors. |
| 3 | MAKING OF A LIVE TV SHOW (1971). 26 minutes. Charles Braverman. |
| 3 | WHY MAN CREATES (1968). 25 minutes. Saul Bass. |

---

Current periodicals respondents find most useful:

| | |
|---|---|
| 18% | Broadcasting |
| 16 | American Cinematographer |
| 16 | Film Comment |

16.

Periodicals (cont.):

| | |
|---|---|
| 13% | Filmmakers Newsletter |
| 13 | Film Quarterly |
| 10 | Sight and Sound |
| 9 | American Film: Journal of the Film and Television Arts |
| 9 | Journal of Broadcasting |
| 9 | Variety |
| 8 | Super 8 Filmaker |
| 4 | Take One |
| 3 | Action: Directors Guild of America |
| 3 | Broadcast Management/Engineering |
| 16 | No Response |

---

Books respondents most often recommend to or require of students:

| | |
|---|---|
| 12% | A SHORT HISTORY OF THE MOVIES (Gerald Mast) |
| 12 | TELEVISION PRODUCTION HANDBOOK (Herbert Zettl) |
| 10 | INDEPENDENT FILMMAKING (Lenny Lipton) |
| 8 | BROADCASTING IN AMERICA: A SURVEY OF TELEVISION AND RADIO (Sydney W. Head) |

Books (cont.):

| | |
|---|---|
| 6% | ELEMENTS OF FILM<br>(Lee R. Bobker) |
| 6 | FILM THEORY AND CRITICISM<br>(Gerald Mast and Marshall Cohen) |
| 6 | GUIDE TO FILMMAKING<br>(Edward Pincus) |
| 6 | THE LIVELIEST ART<br>(Arthur Knight) |
| 4 | AMERICAN CINEMATOGRAPHER'S MANUAL<br>(Joseph Mascelli and Arthur C. Miller) |
| 4 | FILM FORM AND THE FILM SENSE<br>(Sergei Eisenstein) |
| 4 | A PRIMER FOR FILMMAKING<br>(Kenneth Roberts and Win Sharples, Jr.) |
| 4 | UNDERSTANDING MOVIES<br>(Louis Giannetti) |
| 4 | WHAT IS CINEMA?<br>(Andre Bazin) |
| 3 | THE FIVE C's OF CINEMATOGRAPHY<br>(Joseph Mascelli) |
| 3 | A HISTORY OF BROADCASTING IN THE UNITED STATES, 3 volumes<br>(Erik Barnouw) |
| 3 | SIGHT, SOUND, MOTION<br>(Herbert Zettl) |
| 3 | THE TECHNIQUE OF TELEVISION PRODUCTION<br>(Gerald Millerson) |

Professional and/or academic organizations respondents find most valuable:

| | |
|---|---|
| 16% | University Film Association |
| 12 | American Film Institute |
| 11 | National Association of Educational Broadcasters |
| 10 | Broadcast Education Association |
| 8 | Society of Motion Picture and Television Engineers |
| 6 | Society for Cinema Studies |
| 5 | Association for Educational Communications and Technology |
| 5 | Speech Communication Association |
| 3 | Modern Language Association |
| 33 | No Response |

---

## BOOKS, FILMS/VIDEOTAPES, PERIODICALS, ORGANIZATIONS NEEDED

Type of Books needed:

| | |
|---|---|
| Basic film production | 7% |
| Film history | 7 |
| Television production | 4 |
| No Response | 48 |

NOTE: In addition to the above content categorizations, several respondents replied in descriptive terms. Five percent felt that "more scholarly, more critical" works were needed and four percent felt that books should be "better."

Type of films/videotapes needed:

| | |
|---|---|
| Film excerpts | 8% |
| Non-technical films on filmmaking | 7 |
| Technical film production | 7 |
| Technical television production | 6 |
| No Response | 52 |

NOTE: In addition to the above, eight percent of the respondents felt a need for cheaper film/videotape rentals while another six percent indicated a desire for "more accessible" films and videotapes.

Periodicals:

NOTE: Responses to this question were diffuse and were generally made in terms of attitude rather than specific kind. Seventy-three percent of those who responded to the questionnaire did not respond to this question. Five percent of the respondents called for more scholarly, more serious publications, three percent felt a need for "better" periodicals while another three percent said that no new ones were needed.

Organizations:

NOTE: See appendix.

---

Resources/needs in film/television teaching:

Part I. Priority of teaching resources.
(1=Most needed; 6=Least needed)

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Additional faculty | 20% | 9% | 7% | 8% | 7% | 8% |
| Artists-in-residence | 1 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 8 |

Resources/needs (cont.):

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Assistantships, fellowships and scholarships | 7% | 10% | 8% | 13% | 10% | 13% |
| Clerical and technical staff | 3 | 6 | 10 | 9 | 13 | 13 |
| Film/videotape rentals and purchases | 24 | 12 | 15 | 12 | 10 | 7 |
| Guest lecturers | 1 | 4 | 5 | 9 | 13 | 12 |
| Library books and periodicals | 4 | 9 | 12 | 15 | 16 | 14 |
| Production equipment | 28 | 18 | 12 | 10 | 6 | 4 |
| Viewing/monitoring facilities | 5 | 20 | 18 | 11 | 10 | 11 |
| No Response | | | 8 | | | |

Part II. Teaching resources respondents can do without.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Artists-in-residence | 66% | Library books and pericdicals | 22% |
| Guest lecturers | 48 | Viewing/monitoring facilities | 16 |
| Clerical and technical staff | 39 | Production equipment | 14 |
| Additional faculty | 33 | Film/videotape rentals and purchases | 12 |
| Assistantships, fellowships and scholarships | 31 | No Response | 8 |

Respondents were given six possible programs/services from which they chose three to serve their needs:

| | |
|---|---|
| Program to make films more accessible | 70% |
| Conferences and workshops | 58 |
| Program to make television productions more accessible | 47 |
| Job referral service | 43 |
| Information services | 39 |
| Curriculum advisory service | 19 |

---

On the college/university level, film and television study should be considered:

| | |
|---|---|
| Related but separate disciplines | 68% |
| The same discipline | 18 |
| Different and separate disciplines | 8 |
| No Response | 5 |

---

Other academic discipline(s) to which respondents feel television is most closely related:

| | |
|---|---|
| Journalism | 32% |
| Theater/Drama | 20 |
| Communications | 18 |
| Film, Cinema | 11 |

22.

Television (cont.):

| | |
|---|---|
| Art | 10% |
| Radio | 10 |
| Sociology, Social Sciences | 10 |
| English | 9 |
| Speech | 7 |
| All disciplines | 3 |
| No Response | 14 |

NOTE: In all, 59 different disciplines were mentioned in response to this question, but only the preceding appeared in significant percentages.

---

Other academic discipline(s) to which respondents feel film is most closely related:

| | |
|---|---|
| Art | 36% |
| Theater/Drama | 29 |
| English | 28 |
| Communications | 10 |
| Journalism | 10 |
| Television | 10 |
| Sociology, Social Sciences | 6 |
| Humanities | 5 |
| Music | 5 |
| Photography | 5 |

Film (cont.):

| | |
|---|---|
| History | 4% |
| All disciplines | 3 |
| No Response | 12 |

NOTE: A total of 63 different disciplines were mentioned.

---

Need for specialized university level training for elementary/secondary school film/television teachers:

| | Yes | No | N/R |
|---|---|---|---|
| %: | 72 | 20 | 8 |

---

Need for specialized accreditation of film/television departments:

| | Yes | No | N/R |
|---|---|---|---|
| %: | 43 | 44 | 13 |

NOTE: In answer to the question of who should do the accrediting, respondents suggested a panel of representatives from universities and professional organizations (9%); existing accrediting agencies (3%); "don't know" (4%). 66% did not respond to this question.

---

## APPENDIX

p. 1. Departments in which film/tv is taught.

Cluster # 1

- Communications
- Communications and Art
- Communication Arts and Sciences
- Communications Studies
- Mass Communications
- Mass Media
- Media

Cluster # 2

- Broadcasting
- Broadcasting and Film
- Radio/Television
- Radio-Television-Film
- Telecommunications
- Television

Cluster # 3

- Creative Writing
- English
- English and Film
- Languages and Literature
- Literature

Cluster # 4

- Speech
- Speech/Broadcasting
- Speech Communications
- Speech and Drama
- Speech/Drama-Film-Television
- Speech and Theater

Cluster # 5

- Art
- Arts
- Cinema and Art
- Creative Arts
- Design
- Fine Arts
- Fine Arts and Film
- Fine Arts and Theater
- Graphic Arts
- Graphic Design
- Graphics

Cluster # 6

- Cinema
- Cinema Studies
- Film
- Film and Television
- Film and Video
- Moving Image
- Visual Studies

Cluster # 7

- Drama
- Drama and Communications
- Drama and Telecommunications
- Film and Theater
- Theater
- Theater Arts

Cluster # 8

- Audiovisual Education
- Educational Media
- Instructional Materials
- Instructional Media
- Learning Resources
- Library Service
- Media Center
- Media Services

Cluster # 9

- Cinema and Photography
- Photography
- Photography and Cinema
- Photography and Film

Cluster # 10

- Journalism
- Journalism and Communications
- Journalism and Graphics

Cluster # 11

Other:

- American Culture
- American Studies
- Anthropology
- Applied Arts

# 11 Other (cont.):

Architecture
Biological Sciences
Commercial Art
Continuing Education
Criminology
Data Processing
Education
Electronics
Environmental Arts
Experimental Pathology
Government
Geology
History
Humanities
Industrial Technology
Instruction
Liberal Arts
Liberal Studies
Media Technology
Philosophy
Physics
Police Science
Popular Culture
Political Science

p. 19 Organizations needed

Only 25 percent of the total number of respondents answered this question, providing suggestions such as those listed below. Four percent of the respondents indicated that they felt "none" were needed.

Experimental film organization
Film education organization
National student organization
Grant-getting group
Professional television organization
Regional study centers
Film studies organization
Scholarly association of writers and critics
Unions
Organizations to improve access to films
Film seminars
Film aesthetics society
Information department in film institute
Organization to unite academia and industry
Organization for interdisciplinary studies
Film production organization
Filmmakers honorary fraternity
Job placement bureau
College/secondary film teachers' organization
Junior college media organization
Animation organization

## AFTERWORD

The major objective of the National Survey of Film and Television Higher Education was to seek out the needs of the field as expressed by college and university teachers of these subjects. The results must be interpreted: (1) in the light of the nature of the respondents and of their particular situations; (2) in terms of their definition of "the field"; and (3) according to the expression of needs growing out of the first two conditions.

The results must be considered in terms of personal and professional biases. One must ask, for instance, if the expressed needs are, in some cases, simply "want lists" reflecting highly specialized and personal, rather than broadly philosophical and long-range academic judgments. Finally, since we are dealing with a fluid field of study in a changeable society, the expression of needs is necessarily, though not exclusively, pegged at 1976. Thus, the report reflects the present state of the art as well as a certain degree of ignorance not only of the future, but also of existing resources by which some of the needs might easily be met.

It is hoped that the information gathered and presented here will aid individuals, institutions, and organizations in developing programs and services that will fulfill the needs of this aspect of higher education.

The Study Committee